

Date: Sun, 31 Jan 93 04:30:14 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #27
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 31 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 27

Today's Topics:

 (non)Consistency on Language...
 all of this closed repeater stuff
Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open) (2 msgs)
 Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)
 My call sign : ((2 msgs)
Net Control Signing for others on Net (2 msgs)
 Pres. Clinton speech via Packet? (2 msgs)
 Reciprocal License ???

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 31 Jan 1993 01:42:36 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
tamsun.tamu.edu!willis@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: (non)Consistency on Language...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1070@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) misses the
point again and :
[Brian's sarcastic comment deleted]
>
>"These damn new hams-

Jon, I'm sure I won't be the only one to point this out, but with the
holier than thou tone you took in previous postings, how can use you
choose to use language above? You need to either apologize to Jay &

say there is a place for such words, or admit that you don't practice what you preach.

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 06:32:13 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!udel!gatech!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: all of this closed repeater stuff
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jfk@eniac.seas.upenn.edu (Natasha) writes:

> They're allowed - and they're legal. There's no rule that says you have
>to let someone else use your station. There's only a rule that you may
>not accept or require reimbursement for the use of your station. Now
>club run repeaters...and even people run repeaters don't fall under the rule of
>accepting or requiring reimbursement because they're made up of amateurs
>cooperating on "co-owning" a station. People may disagree with me, but
>such club dues for repeaters are perfectly reasonable for a station you
>have an investment in (seriously, how many clubs have ONE person owning a
>repeater? usually, it's the entire club...the club itself).

While I agree with the rest of your post, I have to take exception to your claim here. "Reasonable" has nothing to do with what is legal. The decision point is pretty black and white. Very few provisions of the rules are as clear as those regarding the prohibition of business use. To determine whether a practice is legal, answer the question: "Are there resources on this repeater (or whatever) that I cannot use if I don't pay a fee?" If the answer is "yes", then that policy is illegal regardless of the reasonableness.

There ARE legal ways of accomplishing the goal of having the users share the costs. The most successful method, in my experience, is to simply tell each new user that the machine is user-supported and the usual support is \$xx per year. If, after a couple of direct suggestions the guy does not pony up, write him off as a deadbeat and ignore him. Don't talk to him if you don't want to. There are always the 1%'ers who won't cooperate but the reality is the money from this 1% won't make a hill of beans either way on the repeater budget.

This works just about everywhere except in Jay's and Kurt's World where their egos are made of that stuff that emits from the south end of a northbound bull and are supported on the shoulders of lawsuits. I know it works because I used it for years to support a repeater I owned that I could not afford to fund by myself.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC | Interested in high performance mobility?
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM) | Interested in high tech and computers?
Marietta, Ga | Send ur snail-mail address to
jgd@dixie.com | perform@dixie.com for a free sample mag
Need Usenet public Access in Atlanta? Write Me for info on Dixie.com.

Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1993 04:11:26 GMT
From: ucsnews.sdsu.edu!newshub.sdsu.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
agate!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:
: The basic issue on the open-closed repeater discussion is not if a
: person can limit the use of their repeater but can an individual
: or organization OWN frequencies and prevent others from using
: frequencies in the ham bands.

The coordinated repeater has rights to a coverage area as shown in the
part 97. The uncoordinated repeater or auxiliary station is secondary and
must bare the burdon of correcting any interference to the coordinated
repeater. Any one may use the frequencies by agreement. This applies to
open or closed repeaters.

:

: If repeaters shared frequencies or any one could put up an open
: repeater on any frequency there would be no problem. But when
: there are no open repeaters and no more frequency pairs for
: additional repeaters, and the closed repeaters in the area are
: charging \$300 a year isn't this the same as charging for the use
: of the ham band?

I have never heard of an area with no open repeaters. Even in SoCal there
are uhf frequencies filled with open repeaters. There are "open repeaters"
listed as closed sharing the frequencies with closed repeaters.

Some areas of the country have frequencies known as shared non protected.
This type of operation is more in tune with your proposal. Repeaters come
and go quite regularly on these frequencies. Lots of kids playing, lots of
experimental type, low budget operations. Lots of fun. These frequencies
are as close to anarchy as the crowding allows.

I wish that there were 256 shades of gray between open and closed. The
ARRL only sees fit to distinguish between two states..open and closed.

How about it...Really ..how many kinds of repeaters are there?

open.club.networked.linked.private.packet.autopatch.remote.control.closed

;> bob n6fri

--

Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Sun, 31 Jan 1993 07:43:04 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!genef@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C1nFn3.C4G@iat.holonet.net> bwilkins@iat.holonet.net (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>

>I have never heard of an area with no open repeaters. Even in SoCal there
>are uhf frequencies filled with open repeaters. There are "open repeaters"
>listed as closed sharing the frequencies with closed repeaters.

>

I can vouch for you on that one, Bob... I took my HT down to San Diego (2M/440) and was able to talk all over Southern Cal, even up to Santa Barbara, and the LA area, so I didn't care if there were closed systems around, and that's the philosophy I carry now.

I've learned a lot from this debate, but the fact remains that a closed system is as legal as an open one, and there is nothing to be gained fighting with an owner of a closed system. More than likely you can even get on a closed system with some courtesy and common sense.

Heh...I used to get worked up with repeater debates, and no-code debates. In fact I was for a no-code license, and debated feverishly with other hams, but did the FCC listen to me? Noooo! :(

<sigh> all that work for nothing :>

Gene--WW6K

--

genef@netcom.com

Date: 29 Jan 93 18:42:00 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:
>Jay, you must cut Jon Bloom some slack; Usenet is something he hasn't
>a lot of experience with and therefore he MUST apply his experience
>from other media - he has no other basis.

"These damn new hams--not a one of them could build a decent coherer!
Why, next thing you know they'll be letting 'em in without code and
then things will *really* go down the drain!"

So, just how much experience is enough to be considered one of the
select few whose opinions count?

>Just don't be surprised if he's mistaken in his conclusions as a result.

Yeah, one of my conclusions was that Usenet was run for the benefit
of all of its participants, not just those who had been using it for
X years. My mistake.

But *your* conclusion is mistaken, too. I'm wasn't talking about the
language used on Usenet, I was talking about the language--and the
thinking--used to discuss important issues *irrespective of the
medium.* That you--and Jay, since I believe it was he who renamed
this thread with its current subject--fail to grasp that demonstrates
your Usenet-biased view of communication.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z	jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League	Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St.	I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111	my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: 29 Jan 93 13:01:06 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!warwick!uknet!
edcastle!spider!raft.spider.co.uk!jmorris@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: My call sign : (
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <93026.202138AXH113@psuvm.psu.edu> AXH113@psuvm.psu.edu (Azmi Hashim)
writes:

>Hi all,
>

>I passed my element 2 and 3A on Dec 3, 1993. The problem is that I still
>dont have a call sign. I am really dissapointed because every day I have
>to wait for the mailman to check for my mail from the FCC.

>

Looks like you've got a year or so to wait - if the CC takes six
weeks from you passing... :-)

73, John

--

-John Morris-Spider Systems Ltd-031 554 9424-jmorris@spider.co.uk-GM4ANB@GB7EDN-

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1993 23:36:54 GMT
From: beta.lanl.gov!tjf@lanl.gov
Subject: My call sign : (
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Finally! I took the tests November 20 and my
Technician(plus) arrived today....just about
nine weeks.

By the way, the operator priviledges listing
is just "technician"...no indication that I
did in fact pass the 5 WPM test. Do I have
to keep my certificate of completion with the
license is there no distiction on the license
itself? I passed the written and code tests
the same session.

-Tom, KB5YEM

;^)

.

Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1993 00:47:52 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Net Control Signing for others on Net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I always say:

<net-related stuff....> Back to net-control. KD1HZ.

at the end of each of my net transmissions.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ	-----
-- Domain: mpd@anomaly.sbs.com	- I'm not a bigot, -
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!mpd	- I hate everyone... -
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347	-----

Date: Sat, 30 Jan 1993 16:06:22 GMT

From: swrinde!emory!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!

zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!caen!uvaarpa!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!

jeg7e@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Net Control Signing for others on Net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>I always say:

>

><net-related stuff....> Back to net-control. KD1HZ.

>

>at the end of each of my net transmissions.

That is poor procedure, and you should discontinue it. The regulations require you to sign your assigned callsign ONCE every ten minutes and at the termination of communications.

Instead, stations should use 'tactical' callsigns in nets. These are portable (station operators can relieve or replace each other in the field) indicate relevance in the operation at hand ('rest 1' clearly lets me as Net Control know that this transmission is coming from such and such place on my map) and should not require phoenetic clarification under any circumstances.

As Net Control, I identify every ten minutes, and this is a good time for other stations to ID and satisfy Part 97 regulations. I *NEVER* respond to a transmission like 'KD4CQY' Since it is clearly a Part 97 compliance. However a transmission like 'Police 1' indicates the desire of that station to be scheduled for response by Net Control. There may be other stations with important traffic, on 'simplex' nets other stations may not know that there is traffic being handled. The use of extremely brief transmissions is critical. There is no need to say 'This is Police

Car 1 calling Net Control' (SHEESH!) when 'Police1' will certainly suffice.

Thus repeated identification is not only unnecessary and silly, it is also detrimental to the net.

--

```
-----  
| Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \      /___ |  
| Security and Technology Planning R&D   \    /  /  |  
| I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \  /   /   |  
| The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall    \/ \  /    |  
~~~~~\~~~~~
```

Date: 29 Jan 93 20:47:19 GMT
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@ames.arpa
Subject: Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Alan Bloom writes:

>
> I think the key phrase is "of subject matter of direct interest to the
> amateur service." If it does not have a ham-radio tie-in it shouldn't
> be in a 1-way transmission (such as a packet bulletin.)

Regardless of whether this is legal or not, think about the
implications: if Clinton's speech is ok, then why not the
Constitution of the US? How about the entire Bible? The Koran? The
Book of the Dead? The entire works of Shakespeare, Chairman Mao,
Robert Burns? :-)

Brian McMinn, N5PSS
brian@amd.com

Date: 31 Jan 1993 05:16:51 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C1Mv2v.sp@amdcl2> brian@amd.com writes:
>implications: if Clinton's speech is ok, then why not the
>Book of the Dead? The entire works of Shakespeare, Chairman Mao,

When testing high-speed packet radio data links, I have on occasion used
both the bible and the complete works of Shakespeare as test text.

Sometimes you need a lot of text to test with. Shakespeare is about 6 megabytes, by the way.

A local station used to transmit the New Testament as code practice.
Dunno why he stopped; perhaps he was struck by lightning.

- Brian

Date: 30 Jan 1993 19:35:25 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!rpi!usenet.coe.montana.edu!
news.u.washington.edu!stein.u.washington.edu!dbillon@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Reciprocal License ???
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I am looking for any information about the "reciprocal license".

I am french and I am in the US (Seattle-WA) for 6 months. Last december I have sent an FCC FORM 610-A to the FCC. I am always waiting for any answer.

In the FAQ (amateur radio) I have read that this form is soon to be obsolete and that I should contact a local Volunteer Examiner to get a VE 60-day pass. Later I have heard that there is no 60-day pass for Seattle area.

HELP !!!

73, damien, dbillon@u.washington.edu

Date: 30 Jan 93 23:41:12 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!ringer!lonestar.utsa.edu!
dlaro@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8573@lib.tmc.edu>, <Jan27.214742.55990@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<8583@lib.tmc.edu>utsa
Subject : Re: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

In article <8583@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>
>You're no better than the second vice president; Julian Macassey and John
>Stanley beat you to it by quite a bit. I routinely ignore both.
>--
>Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
>jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
> "begin 666 foo 266]U(&AA=F4@;F\@;&EF92X: ` end" -- Daniel Drucker

Come on, Jay. Give it a rest. You're not going to change any minds, but you are making it unpleasant to read through this forum. You have options, several, so try one of them.. Please.

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1993 15:23:01 GMT
From: ucsnews.sdsu.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!
udel!gatech!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!m2.dseg.ti.com!
ernest!cmptrc!mitch@network.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93026.202138AXH113@psuvm.psu.edu>,
<weaverb.728109631@rintintin.Colorado.EDU>,
<1993Jan27.090717.2148@guvax.acc.georgetown.edu>
Subject : Re: My call sign : (

I got the Feb issue of QST the other day and was reading in it. There was a note about the length of time it was taking to get the new liscenses out to new hams. They mentioned that they had taken steps to add people to the department to clear out the backlog. Hang in there, you'll get it soon I'm sure.

Mitcheal
KA5S0I
(novice heading to Tech and beyond!)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #27
